stricken. It as to whether the measure should be heaped o[illegible]er practice, was pointed out to them that Rule 6 allows eit[illegible]standing if there is a usage or an express or implied unde[illegible]heaped in support of it. Many members thought that [illegible]best measures would lead to fraud and that it would be [illegible]ts to have stricken measures alone to protect the interes[illegible] of the ignorant peasantry and the buyers in the market. A few members however were of opinion that stricken measures would take time and that fraud could be practised even then. The majority of the members were, however, of opinion that there should be uniformity, that is, both methods of measuring should not be allowed.

Reply of Government.—Noted.

SUBJECT No. 11.

Amendment of Section 3 of the Infant Marriages Prevention Regulation.

Messrs. U. S. Siva Rao, and S. Manjiah, Chikmagalur Municipality.

Summary of discussion.—Section 3 of the Regulation to prevent infant marriages may be so amended as to make it penal to marry a boy of less than 16 years of age to a girl who is not younger than he by at least six years.

The members wanted that the Law should be so changed that there should be a difference of at least six years between the ages of husband and wife.

Reply of Government.—A Bill may be drafted and submitted through the Representatives of the Assembly in the Legislative Council.

SUBJECT No. 12.

Widow Re-Marriage Act.

Mr. H. Krishnappa, Law Association, Bangalore.

Summary of discussion.—The Widow Re-Marriage Act (Act XV of 1856) may be introduced into the State.

Mr. Krishnappa explained the necessity for the measure by pointing out that in the absence of an Act legalising widow marriage among Hindus, the offspring of such marriages would not be recognised as legitimate by the courts, and that unless the parents took care to will away their property to the children, the latter would have no rights of inheritance to their parents' property. The member also said that the recent Census disclosed a large increase in the number of Hindu widows. Mr. H. Krishna Sastri opposed the suggestion, while Mr. Surasastri said that there could be no objection to the measure if the Gurus of the Matts approved of it. Mr. C. Srinivasa Rao was in favour of the introduction of the Act and remarked that it was an economic waste that widows of child-bearing age should be indirectly prevented from marrying. Mr. Krishnappa said that he knew of only two instances of such marriages having taken place.

Reply of Government.—Noted.

SUBJECT No. 13.

Amendment of Order XXI, Rule 57, of the Civil Procedure Code.

Mr. S. R. Balakrishna Rao, Shimoga Municipality.

Summary of discussion.—The new rule whereby the attachment of immovable property is determined by operation of law may be repealed. In many cases the decree-holder is unable to proceed with the execution

proceedings owing to the difficulty of ascertaining the encumbrances on the property, or his inability to have the notice served on the judgment-debtor (Sec. 38, clause 482) or other similar causes. Very often the decree-holder grants time to the judgment-debtor for payment of the amount decreed by the court. If in such cases the attachment is to cease, the judgment-debtor will be enabled to alienate the property and place it beyond the reach of the decree-holder.

Reply of Government.—Will be referred to the Rules Committee.

SUBJECT No. 14.

Amendment of Rule 3, Schedule (1), Order XXXII, of the Civil Procedure Code.

Mr. S. Seetharamiah, Shimoga taluk.

Summary of discussion.—This Rule makes it obligatory that a notice should be served on the minor defendant before an order is passed for the appointment of a guardian. As this procedure is opposed to judicial principles, the Rule may be amended.

This was considered along with subject No. 15.

SUBJECT No. 15.

Amendment of the Civil Procedure Code *re* issue of notices to minors.

Mr. Guru Rao, Mysore District Board.

Summary of discussion.—The Civil Procedure Code requires the issue of notice to minors when they are parties in a suit. This being of no use, it is prayed that this rule may either be amended or so modified as to bring minors of above ten years within its operation.

Reply of Government.—The question has been referred to the Rules Committee. Let us await the receipt of the recommendation of that body.

SUBJECT No. 16.

Amendment of Municipal Regulation.

Messrs. M. C. Rangiengar, M Venkatakrishniah Amble Anniah Pandit and Banumiah, Mysore City Municipality.

Summary of discussion.—It is prayed that the Municipal Regulation be amended as a whole.

Reply of Government.—Under consideration.

SUBJECT No. 17.

Amendment of Section 164 of Municipal Regulation.

Messrs. K. Shankaranarayana Rao, Shimoga Municipality, U. S. Siva Rao, and S. Manjiah, Chikmagalur Municipality.

Summary of discussion.—Municipal Councils have no power at present to proceed against immovable property for the recovery of mohatarfa arrears on vacant building sites, etc., and have only to file suits in civil courts for the purpose. As this tedious procedure causes unnecessary expenditure and delay in the recovery of arrears, Section 164 of the Municipal Regulation may be so amended as to enable the Councils to exercise this power independently of the said courts.

Messrs. V. Raghavachar, K. Ramanujiengar, H. Krishnappa and Karnik Krishnamurti Rao opposed the suggestion on the ground that, as the orders of the Municipal Councils would be final they should not be given the power of recovering arrears due on vacant building sites independently of the civil courts. Messrs. Anniah Pandit and Usman Khan supported the prayer and remarked that